

1 SUMMARY OF SUBSTANCE OF EXAMINER INTERVIEW OF NOVEMBER 4, 2004

2 UNDER MPEP § 713.04.

3 A telephonic interview was held on November 4, 2004 with participants
4 Michael Roswell, Examiner; John Cabeca, Examiner; and Mark Farrell, counsel
5 for the Applicants.

6 1) Cited prior art “WinAmp2” was discussed. WinAmp2 provides a
7 “skinnable” GUI. It was pointed out that Applicants’ list system, on the other
8 hand, provides a standardized list generator (e.g., a *generic*, universal engine, that
9 extends an API and works across different platforms and applications) that can be
10 included by original equipment manufacturers (OEMs) in appliances that use
11 embedded computing elements: e.g., a car, a kitchen blender with a face display, a
12 sound system, etc. In other words, Applicants’ subject matter provides a pre-
13 packaged list display system or interface (API) that works in a wide variety of
14 appliances and applications, without an OEM having to write custom list
15 generating code for each particular platform or application:

16
17 “The systems and methods as described, thus provide a way to provide a
18 standardized way to create common user interface mechanisms, such as
19 display lists, while affording a product manufacturer to alter the visual
appearance of the user interface. As a result, a single application can be
utilized on multiple platforms to provide similar user experiences.” (Page
23 of Applicants’ specification, emphasis added.)

20
21 2) Claim 34 was discussed. Applicants discussed a proposed
22 amendment to claim 34, citing the incorporation of matter found in the
23 specification and limitations previously presented in base claim 26. The Examiner
24 noted that the proposed amendment seemingly overcomes prior art found in the
25

1 WinAmp 2 reference and suggested narrowing language found in the proposed
2 amendment, such as changing or deleting “capable of being used.” The Examiner
3 pointed out that all the limitations of claim 26 did not appear to be incorporated as
4 verbatim language of claim 26 into the proposed amendment. Applicant aired the
5 possibility of adding proposed claim 34 as a new claim, such as in an amendment
6 or a separate continuation application. The Examiner suggested formalizing the
7 possibility in a response to the outstanding Office Action.

8 It should be noted that the Examiners were courteous and genuinely helpful
9 in trying to bring the case forward.

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25